IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 8169 of 2006

DATED: 24.4.2006

Between:

B.Venkataiah petitioner

And

APSRTC,

Rep by its Vice Chairman and Managing Director,

Musheerabad,

Hyderabad district and another Respondents

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.RAMANA

-

WRIT PETITION NO.8169 of 2006

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner is employed as a Conductor in the respondent corporation. While he was performing his duty as conductor, on 6.2.2005 due to applying sudden brakes by the driver of the bus, the petitioner suffered a fracture to his left leg. The petitioner

underwent treatment at Nizams Institute of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad. The petitioner states that due to fracture to his left leg he is not in a position to move freely in the bus and facing difficulty in discharging his duties as a conductor and made an application to the Depot Manager to allot light duties. Since, no action was taken on the application filed by the petitioner for providing light duties, he made another representation dated 8.12.2005 to the 2nd respondent /Regional Manager and the same is pending and no orders are passed. The petitioner alleges that there are certain persons who were initially appointed as conductors and drivers, but are continuously working in the office and attending to light duties, though they do not have any disability. Hence, the writ petition questioning the action of the respondents in not allotting light duties to the petitioner.

Heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for respondent corporation.

As per the averments made in writ petition, the petitioner was declared fit to perform his duties as conductor. The decision with regard to allotment of light duties to an employee has to be taken by the concerned authorities subject to availability of work and the disability suffered by the concerned employee. Thus, it is purely an administrative function and this Court cannot direct the respondents to provide light work to an employee. Hence, the second respondent is directed to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 8.12.2005, if any pending and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

Subject to above direction, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

_____

N.V.RAMANA,J

DATE: 24.4.2006

TVK

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 8169 of 2006

DATED: 24.4.2006